

CQF Pilot Survey  
Phase III  
July 27, 2015

1. Did you and your organization achieve your goals? Please provide a detailed response.

We are on plan to achieve our goals. Our project has been accepted as a demo at the AMIA Fall Symposium, at which time we aim to demonstrate a fully functional system. The authoring tool will generate HQMF documents, these documents will be executed against an i2b2 instance containing test data. The HQMF documents will also be used to generate KNIME workflows that can be executed against data stored in local repositories.

2. What work products/deliverables did you produce (e.g., knowledge artifacts)? What was the target timeline and actual timeline for producing them?

We are producing and authoring tool for HQMF that supports research phenotype creation (PhAT), an online library of phenotype algorithms with supporting infrastructure (PheKB), and an execution environment (i2b2 hive cell, KNIME translator). Our timeline to complete fully operational tools is by AMIA Fall Symposium. We are on track to satisfy this timeline.

3. Please describe the resources needed to produce Phase III work products. Resources can be defined as programmer/analyst hours, participation in the All Hands meeting, participation in HL7 based weekly calls, providing rationale to management to participate in the pilot, etc. Did you contribute any comments to the HL7 ballot (January/May 2015)? If you did, were they responded to by the CQF team in a timely fashion? If not, why not?

We will upgrade the authoring tool and execution platforms to support CQL in Phase III. We will leverage the CQL code available on github for this purpose. We expect to make use of a Java programmer, currently do not have a precise estimate on hours required.

4. Has your team updated its work products to reflect changes in each of the balloted standards? If yes, please provide an example. If no, please provide a brief explanation of why the update to the specification was not included.

We will update our work product to reflect adoption of CQL as part of the CQF standard.

5. What, if anything, could have made your pilot more successful? Please include tangible resources, like funding or guidance documents, and intangibles, like alternative pilot sites or support from leadership.

Programmer resources are our primary rate limiting factor. While we have necessary expertise to implement the project, more would be better.

6. Did you receive the support from the CQF project team that you expected? Please explain.

The project team has provided us with valuable guidance on the current state of the CQF standards, and how they will evolve moving forward. This is the kind of support we were looking for in joining as a pilot project.

7. On a scale of 1-10 (one being the least satisfied, and 10 the most), please rate your overall experience with the CQF project. Are there specific issues of which you think the CQF project and/or the Standards and Interoperability program should be aware?

I would say our experience has been very good (10), and we are looking forward to deepening our relationship over time.